

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/022,888	12/20/2001	Tatsuki Kouwa	Q66962	2127		
7:	590 04/22/2004		EXAMINER			
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS			GONZALEZ, JULIO C			
2100 Pennsylva Washington, D	ania Avenue, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
washington, D	20037		2834			
				DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	26				
Advisory Action	10/022,888	KOUWA, TATSUKI	,, <u> </u>				
•	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Julio C. Gonzalez	2834					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	;				
THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply t ich places the application	to a on in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.7 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See M 136(a) and the appropriate extension of the final Office action; or (2) a	MPEP ension fee on fee under as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or simp	olifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed ar	nendment				
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT p	place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were r	newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			i an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2 and 7-10</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>3-6</u> .							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme							
10. Other:							
-							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: arguments are not persuasive. Prior art disclosure stills reads on base claims.

Nicholas Ponomarenko Primary Examiner

Technology Center 2800